



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/789,144

02/27/2004

Jeffrey A. Tilton

25353A

9228

22889

7590

11/29/2006

OWENS CORNING
2790 COLUMBUS ROAD
GRANVILLE, OH 43023

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

C

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/789,144	TILTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew T. Piziali	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6, 7, 14, 16-37 and 41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/27/04 & 10/23/06 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 10/23/2006 has been entered. The examiner has withdrawn the 35 USC 112 rejections of claims 9-11 and 42-44 based on the amendment to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,497,950 to Haile in view of USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman et al. (hereinafter referred to as Kelman).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46, Haile discloses that it is known in the headliner art to use thermoplastic bicomponent staple fibers (considered to read on the claimed thermoplastic staple fibers and the claimed thermoplastic bicomponent fibers) and glass staple fibers (see entire document including column 1, line 45 through column 2, line 8, column 10, lines 49-58, column 12, lines 10-60, column 13, line 22-64, column 14, lines 27-50, and column 17, lines 52-57). Haile is silent with regards to specific headliner designs, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional headliner designs. Kelman provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the headliner art to use a liner/insulator design comprising a base layer of fibrous material and a plurality of ribs of fibrous material thermally bonded to the base layer (see entire document including

Art Unit: 1771

column 1, lines 41-49, column 2, lines 38-47, column 3, lines 48-57, and Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the headliner of Haile in the design disclosed by Kelman, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Haile and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known headliner design on the basis of its suitability and desired characteristics.

Regarding claims 3 and 39, Haile discloses the use of polyester thermoplastic fibers (column 2, lines 26-39).

Regarding claims 5 and 40, Kelman discloses that the ribs extend parallel to one another (Figure 3).

Regarding claims 9-11 and 42-44, Haile does not specifically mention the wet compression percentage, dry compression percentage, or dry wet recovery percentage, but considering that the liner/insulator taught by the applied prior art is identical to the claimed liner/insulator in terms of structure and materials, it appears that the liner/insulator taught by the applied prior art inherently possesses the claimed properties.

The Patent and Trademark Office can require applicants to prove that prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess characteristics of claimed products where claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes; burden of proof is on applicants where rejection based on inherency under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or on prima facie obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, jointly or alternatively, and Patent and Trademark Office's inability to manufacture products or to

Art Unit: 1771

obtain and compare prior art products evidences fairness of this rejection, *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 431 (CCPA 1977).

Regarding claim 12, Haile does not specifically mention using the liner/insulator as an automotive undercarpet, but since the claim fails to further structurally define the liner/insulator, it appears that the liner/insulator taught by the applied prior art can be considered an automotive undercarpet.

Regarding claims 13 and 45, Haile does not specifically mention making the liner/insulator from scrap fibrous material, but Haile does disclose that the liner/insulator is made of a fibrous material. It is the examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article.

Regarding claims 15 and 46, Kelman discloses that the liner/insulator may be a nonlamine (Figure 3).

4. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,497,950 to Haile in view of USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46 above, and further in view of USPN 5,892,187 to Patrick.

Kelman is silent with regards to the distance between ribs and the width of the ribs, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional distances between ribs and rib widths. Patrick provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the headliner art to vary the distance between ribs, and the width of the ribs, based on the desired sound or noise to be attenuated (see entire document including column 4, lines 52-67 and column 5, lines 44-57). Patrick specifically discloses that the width of the ribs may be about 22 mm or less (0.87 inches or less) and illustrates a distance between the ribs about equal

Art Unit: 1771

to the specifically mentioned rib width (column 5, lines 44-57 and Figures 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the ribs spaced apart at least about 0.25 inches and with a width of between about 0.5 to about 3.0 inches, as taught by Patrick, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention taught by the prior art and based on the desired sound or noise to be attenuated.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,497,950 to Haile in view of USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman et al. (hereinafter referred to as Kelman) in view of USPN 5,399,422 to Dijkema et al. (hereinafter referred to as Dijkema).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46, Haile discloses that it is known in the headliner art to use thermoplastic bicomponent staple fibers (considered to read on the claimed thermoplastic staple fibers and the claimed thermoplastic bicomponent fibers) and glass staple fibers (see entire document including column 1, line 45 through column 2, line 8, column 10, lines 49-58, column 12, lines 10-60, column 13, line 22-64, column 14, lines 27-50, and column 17, lines 52-57). Haile is silent with regards to specific headliner designs, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional headliner designs. Kelman provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the headliner art to use a liner/insulator design comprising a base layer of fibrous material and a plurality of ribs of fibrous material thermally bonded to the base layer (see entire document including column 1, lines 41-49, column 2, lines 38-47, column 3, lines 48-57, and Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 1771

made to make the headliner of Haile in the design disclosed by Kelman, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Haile and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known headliner design on the basis of its suitability and desired characteristics.

In the event that it is shown that Haile does not disclose the use of glass staple fibers with sufficient specificity, Dijkema is relied upon to disclose that it is known in the headliner art to use glass staple fibers (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3 and column 4, lines 43-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the glass fibers in staple fiber form, as taught by Dijkema, because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known fiber form on the basis of its suitability and desired characteristics.

Regarding claims 3 and 39, Haile discloses the use of polyester thermoplastic fibers (column 2, lines 26-39).

Regarding claims 5 and 40, Kelman discloses that the ribs extend parallel to one another (Figure 3).

Regarding claims 9-11 and 42-44, Haile does not specifically mention the wet compression percentage, dry compression percentage, or dry wet recovery percentage, but considering that the liner/insulator taught by the applied prior art is identical to the claimed liner/insulator in terms of structure and materials, it appears that the liner/insulator taught by the applied prior art inherently possesses the claimed properties.

Regarding claim 12, Haile does not specifically mention using the liner/insulator as an automotive undercarpet, but since the claim fails to further structurally define the liner/insulator,

Art Unit: 1771

it appears that the liner/insulator taught by the applied prior art can be considered an automotive undercarpet.

Regarding claims 13 and 45, Haile does not specifically mention making the liner/insulator from scrap fibrous material, but Haile does disclose that the liner/insulator is made of a fibrous material. It is the examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article.

Regarding claims 15 and 46, Kelman discloses that the liner/insulator may be a nonlamine (Figure 3).

6. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,497,950 to Haile in view of USPN 5,660,908 to Kelman in view of USPN 5,399,422 to Dijkema as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13, 15, 38-40 and 42-46 above, and further in view of USPN 5,892,187 to Patrick.

Kelman is silent with regards to the distance between ribs and the width of the ribs, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional distances between ribs and rib widths. Patrick provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the headliner art to vary the distance between ribs, and the width of the ribs, based on the desired sound or noise to be attenuated (see entire document including column 4, lines 52-67 and column 5, lines 44-57). Patrick specifically discloses that the width of the ribs may be about 22 mm or less (0.87 inches or less) and illustrates a distance between the ribs about equal to the specifically mentioned rib width (column 5, lines 44-57 and Figures 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the ribs spaced apart at least about 0.25 inches and with a width of between about

Art Unit: 1771

0.5 to about 3.0 inches, as taught by Patrick, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention taught by the prior art and based on the desired sound or noise to be attenuated.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts the headliner material disclosed by Haile possesses rigidity and shape retention and therefore one skilled in the art would not be motivated to make the headliner in the design disclosed by Kelman. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although Haile discloses that the headliner material is capable of maintaining the shape and appearance of the product over time (column 3, lines 5-7), Kelman teaches that the disclosed headliner design provides high strength (column 1, lines 31-35) and imparts "additional stiffness and shape-retention properties to the headliner (underline added)." (column 2, lines 48-61). Kelman clearly discloses that even when a headliner possesses stiffness and shape-retention properties, additional stiffness and shape-retention properties are desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the headliner material of Haile in the design disclosed by Kelman, because the headliner would advantageously possess additional stiffness and shape-retention properties.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the

Art Unit: 1771

time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

atp

978 11/24/06

ANDREW PIZIALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER